

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, and 24-33 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, 24, and 26-33 are amended, and claims 4-6, 8, 16-17, 23, and 34-35 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 9, 11, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. It also appears that claim 26 is similarly rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation “weighted values” in claims 9 and 11. Claims 9 and 11 are amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis.

The Office Action alleges that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the recitation “weighted values” in claim 19. Claim 19 is amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis.

The Office Action alleges that the recitation “configured to include sequences and scripts” in claim 26 is vague and indefinite because the specification is allegedly unclear with regard to what “sequences” and “scripts” are. Although this rejection is respectfully traversed in view of support recited on page 13, lines 3-13, of the specification clearly describing what “sequences” and “scripts” are, claim 26 is amended to delete the recitation to further prosecution of the application.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Burnett and Williams

Claims 1-6, 12-17, and 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0087408 to Burnett (hereinafter “Burnett”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,977,964 to Williams et al. (hereinafter “Williams”). As noted above, claims 4-6, 16-17, 23, and 34 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regard to claims 4-6, 16-17, 23, and 34. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Under the §103(a) rejection of the above-identified claims, the Office Action, at page 3, further notes that claims 1-6, 12-17, and 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Burnett. Applicant believes that this §102(b) rejection was mistakenly carried over from the first Office Action and should have been deleted in light of the current §103(a) rejection because the current Office Action goes on to note that Burnett fails to teach a certain recitation of the above-identified claims. Therefore, Applicant only addresses the §103(a) rejection in this response.

A. Claims 1-3, 12-15, and 22 are allowable.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services comprises determining at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service; determining a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting; and prioritizing the at least one offered service based on the determined weighted value.

Burnett does not teach, suggest, or describe a method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services as recited by claim 1. On the contrary, Burnett describes a method for facilitating Internet-assisted commerce including receiving a selected product type, receiving a selected product sub-type based on the selected product type, receiving one or more selections of product attributes, determining a list of records that fulfill the search criteria, and providing the list of database records ranked by the user selecting an attribute and specifying ascending or descending order. Burnett, paragraphs 0140-0162.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Burnett fails to teach, suggest, or describe that at least one of the database records is associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one database record and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one database record. Moreover, Burnett fails to teach, suggest, or describe determining a weighted value associated with the at least one database record based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting and prioritizing the at least one database record based on the determined

weighted value. Instead, Burnett describes ranking the database records based on an attribute selected by a user and a specification of ascending or descending order.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Williams to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Burnett. However, like Burnett, Williams does not teach, suggest, or describe a method for providing automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic services as recited by claim 1. In contrast, Williams describes a method for automatically configuring a system based on a user's monitored system interaction and preferred system access times including monitoring user interaction with a system; developing, updating, and refining user preference information stored in a user profile database based on the monitored user interaction; determining which user of a plurality of system users is currently using the system; and dynamically configuring the operating parameters of the system in accordance with the user preference information of the user profile. Williams, col. 3, lines 6-38. Williams further describes receiving a request to view a television schedule grid which displays current channel selections for a predetermined period of time and displaying the channels in the grid in the order of most frequently watched to least frequently watched. Williams, col. 7, lines 31-57.

This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Williams fails to teach, suggest, or describe that at least one of the current channels is associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one of the current channels and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one of the current channels. Moreover, William fails to teach, suggest, or describe determining a weighted value associated with the at least one of the current channels based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting and prioritizing the at least one database record based on the determined weighted value. Instead, Burnett describes ranking the current channels in order of most frequently watched to least frequently watched.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams. Since claims 2-3 and 12 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-3 and 12. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Independent claim 13 includes recitations similar to the recitations of claim 1. Thus, for at least the reasons given above with regard to claim 1, claim 13 is also allowable over the

combined teaching of Burnett and Williams. Since claims 14-15 and 22 depend from claim 13 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 14-15 and 22. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

B. Claims 24-33 are allowable.

As amended, claim 24 recites that a system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services comprises a service suggestion analyzer operatively coupled to the cypher, the service suggestion analyzer configured to determine at least one offered service associated with the at least one keyword, the at least one offered service associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one offered service and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one offered service, determine a weighted value associated with the at least one offered service based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting, and prioritize the at least one offered service based on the determined weighted value.

Burnett does not teach, describe, or suggest a system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services as recited by claim 24. On the contrary, Burnett describes a system for facilitating Internet-assisted commerce including a user interface program operative to receive a selected product type, receive a selected product sub-type based on the selected product type, and receive one or more selections of product attributes; and a search program operative to determine a list of records that fulfill the search criteria and provide the list of database records ranked by the user selecting an attribute and specifying ascending or descending order. Burnett, paragraphs 0140-0162.

This is not analogous to the system recited by claim 24 because Burnett fails to teach, suggest, or describe that at least one of the database records is associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one database record and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one database record. Moreover, Burnett fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the user interface program, search program, or any other component of the system is operative to determine a weighted value associated with the at least one database record based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting and prioritize the at least one database record based on the determined

weighted value. Instead, Burnett describes that the search program ranks the database records based on an attribute selected by a user and a specification of ascending or descending order.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Williams to allegedly cure the deficiencies of Burnett. However, like Burnett, Williams does not teach, suggest, or describe a system for automatically facilitated marketing and provision of electronic security services as recited by claim 24. In contrast, Williams describes a system for automatically configuring a system based on a user's monitored system interaction and preferred system access times including a system controller operative to monitor user interaction with a system; develop, update, and refine user preference information stored in a user profile database based on the monitored user interaction; determine which user of a plurality of system users is currently using the system; and dynamically configure the operating parameters of the system in accordance with the user preference information of the user profile. Williams, col. 3, lines 6-38. Williams further describes that the system controller is operative to receive a request to view a television schedule grid which displays current channel selections for a predetermined period of time and display the channels in the grid in the order of most frequently watched to least frequently watched. Williams, col. 7, lines 31-57.

This is not analogous to the system recited by claim 24 because Williams fails to teach, suggest, or describe that at least one of the current channels is associated with a technical weighting indicating a technical relevance of the at least one of the current channels and a preference weighting indicating a provider preference of the at least one of the current channels. Moreover, William fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the system controller is operative to determine a weighted value associated with the at least one of the current channels based on the associated technical weighting and the associated preference weighting and prioritize the at least one database record based on the determined weighted value. Instead, Burnett describes that the system controller ranks the current channels in order of most frequently watched to least frequently watched.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 24 is allowable over the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams. Since claims 25-33 depend from claim 24 and recite further claim features, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams does not make obvious Applicant's claimed invention as embodied in claims 25-33. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Burnett and Williams and Lawrence

Claims 7-11, 18-21, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Burnett in view of Williams and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,738,780 to Lawrence et al. (hereinafter “Lawrence”). As noted above, claims 8 and 35 are canceled without prejudice of disclaimer, rendering this rejection moot with regard to claims 8 and 35. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A. Claims 7 and 9-11 are allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams. Since claims 7 and 9-11 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features and since Lawrence fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies in the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Burnett, Williams, and Lawrence does not make obvious Applicant’s claimed invention as embodied in claims 7 and 9-11. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

B. Claims 18-21 are allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 13 is allowable over the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams. Since claims 18-21 depend from claim 13 and recite further claim features and since Lawrence fails to cure the above-identified deficiencies in the combined teaching of Burnett and Williams, Applicant respectfully submits that the combined teaching of Burnett, Williams, and Lawrence does not make obvious Applicant’s claimed invention as embodied in claims 18-21. Accordingly, Applicant requests withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicant asserts that the pending claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, and 24-33 are in condition for allowance. Applicant further asserts that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-3, 7, 9-15, 18-22, and 24-33 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicant's attorney at 404.815.1900.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: March 5, 2007

/Jodi L. Hartman/

Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900

